

Scaling Law of Confined Spin-Hall Effect

Xuhui Wang,^{1,*} Jiang Xiao,^{2,†} Aurélien Manchon,¹ and Sadamichi Maekawa^{3,4}

¹*King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST),*

Physical Science and Engineering Division, Thuwal 23955-6900, Saudi Arabia

²*Department of Physics and State Key Laboratory of Surface Physics, Fudan University, Shanghai 200433, China*

³*Advanced Science Research Center, Japan Atomic Energy Agency, Tokai 319-1195, Japan*

⁴*CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency, Tokyo 102-0075, Japan*

(Dated: August 1, 2014)

We incorporate quantum size effect to investigate the extrinsic spin-Hall effect in ultrathin metal films. A Lippmann-Schwinger formalism based theoretical method, accounting for quantum confinement and surface roughness scattering, is developed to calculate both spin-Hall and longitudinal resistivities and spin-Hall angle. The presence of quantum confinement gives rise to a linear relation $\rho_{\text{SH}} = \alpha\rho + \beta$ between the extrinsic spin-Hall resistivity ρ_{SH} and longitudinal charge resistivity ρ . The linear term $\alpha\rho$ originates from side jump, and the constant β is due to skew scattering. This deviates significantly from the commonly accepted scaling law $\rho_{\text{SH}} = a\rho^2 + b\rho$ in a bulk conductor. Thus we call for cautious interpretation of experimental data when applying the scaling law.

PACS numbers: 72.25.Ba, 72.10.Fk, 72.15.Eb, 75.70.Tj

Electric manipulation of spin degree of freedom is desirable in the rising field of spintronics. And spin-Hall effect, generating a spin current moving transverse to the charge flow without magnetism or magnetic field, promises a venue offering exactly that [1–3]. In nonmagnetic metals, spin-orbit coupled bulk impurity scatters charge carriers in a spin-selective manner and enables the spin-Hall effect. This is the so-called extrinsic spin-Hall effect [4, 5] that differs from its intrinsic sibling which is contingent on particular band structures created by spin-orbit interaction [6, 7]. After decades of theoretical and experimental assaults, the origins of spin-Hall effect and anomalous Hall effect (in magnetic metals) are shown to share many in common. Just as in anomalous Hall effect, theories suggest that [8–10] the extrinsic spin-Hall effect, too, is dominated by two distinct mechanisms, skew scattering [11] and side jump [12]. In layman’s terms, side jump describes the spin-dependent deflection of the electron velocity to opposite directions transverse to the current upon scattering by an impurity; however, skew scattering is a manifestation of asymmetric scattering by the spin-orbit coupling carried by impurities [10].

In most experiments [13–18], transverse spin-Hall resistivity ρ_{SH} (or conductivity σ_{SH}) and longitudinal charge resistivity ρ are often acquired to characterize charge-to-spin conversion through spin-Hall angle $\theta_{\text{SH}} = \rho_{\text{SH}}/\rho$. Apart from the intrinsic effect not considered here, it is widely accepted that skew scattering contributes a $\rho_{\text{SH}} \propto \rho$, while side jump offers $\rho_{\text{SH}} \propto \rho^2$; and the sum yields an overall scaling law [9]

$$\rho_{\text{SH}} \approx a\rho^2 + b\rho. \quad (1)$$

That such a compact scaling relation bridges the macroscopic quantities measured in experiments and microscopic processes proposed by quantum theory makes it one of the central topics in condensed matter research. In

anomalous Hall effect, for example, this scaling relation is used frequently to parse the underlying mechanisms from the plots of transverse charge resistivity ρ_{AH} versus ρ [10]. Temperature and impurity concentration are the common variables being tuned to vary resistivities and thus acquire the ρ_{AH} versus ρ curves. Yet another elegant experimental paradigm, as proposed recently by Tian *et al.* [19], opted for the sample thickness as the adjustable parameter to achieve changes in resistivities. Their results, however, call for more meticulous review on the application of the existing scaling law in an anomalous Hall system.

Indeed, theoretical effort that concludes with relation (1) often assumes a bulk conductor [9, 10]. But modern-day spin-Hall or anomalous Hall experiments are usually performed in ultrathin films as thin as a few monolayers. This juxtaposition no longer justifies the negligence of confinement and surface roughness. Early transport experiments and theories have already pointed out an important phenomenon that charge conductivity in thin films can be modified dramatically by quantum confinement coupled with surface roughness scattering [20–22]. More recent studies in combining confinement with spin active surfaces propose unconventional ways to generate spin-Hall effect by either interfacial spin-orbit coupling [23, 24] or even surface roughness [25]. We are therefore much intrigued by possible novelties arising from merging the quantum size effect and spin-Hall phenomenon.

In this Letter, we incorporate quantum confinement and surface roughness into a theoretical analysis of the extrinsic spin-Hall effect. We discover that the spin-Hall resistivities (conductivities) due to side jump and skew scattering, in the presence of quantum confinement, acquire different thickness dependencies. More importantly, for the change in resistivities measured in experiments as a result of varying thickness, the quantum con-

finement provides a linear scaling law $\rho_{\text{SH}} \approx \alpha\rho + \beta$, deviating significantly from formula (1). We must therefore emphasize that parsing the underlying physical mechanisms using the existing scaling law shall be carried out with caution. Moreover, we find that the spin-Hall angle can be tuned by surface roughness fluctuation. This may provide an alternative route, in addition to tuning impurity concentration [18], towards an efficient control of the charge-spin interconversion.

We are primarily interested in nonmagnetic metals that accommodate spin-orbit coupled impurity and thus robust extrinsic spin-Hall effect [13, 15]. Our model includes a bulk spin-orbit scattering potential $V_{\text{SO}} = -i\eta_{\text{SO}}\hat{\sigma} \cdot (\nabla V_1 \times \nabla)$, generated as a relativistic correction to δ -type nonmagnetic impurities $V_1 = V_{\text{imp}} \sum_i \delta(\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_i)$ located at $\mathbf{r}_i$ [9]. We assume that V_1 has a magnitude V_{imp} and impurity concentration n_i . η_{SO} is the spin-orbit coupling constant and $\hat{\sigma}$ the Pauli matrix. In the free electron model, the impurity scattering potential V_1 gives rise to the well-known transport relaxation rate $\tau_0^{-1} = mV_{\text{imp}}^2 n_i k_F / \pi \hbar^3$ and Drude conductivity $\sigma_0 = e^2 \tau_0 n_e / m$, where n_e is the electron density [26].

To introduce quantum confinement, we consider the metal film to have an average thickness d and is terminated by two infinite potential barriers at two surfaces. From the energy point of view, the film is then modelled as a square well potential $U_0(z)$ [21, 22]. For an electron with effective mass m , its motion along the confinement direction $\hat{z}$, described by a Hamiltonian $H_{0,\perp} = \hbar^2 k_z^2 / 2m$, is quantized into $n_c = \lfloor k_F d / \pi \rfloor$ conducting channels. Here, k_F is the Fermi wave vector and the floor function $\lfloor a \rfloor$ gives the largest integer not greater than a . On the other hand, the motion in the xy plane is captured by a Hamiltonian $H_{0,\parallel} = \hbar^2 (k_x^2 + k_y^2) / 2m$. A free electron state of spin- s in channel n is thus represented by a wave function

$$|\mathbf{k}ns\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\mathcal{V}}} \sin\left(\frac{n\pi}{d}z\right) e^{i\mathbf{p}\cdot\mathbf{k}} |s\rangle \quad (2)$$

together with an energy eigenvalue $E_{\mathbf{k}ns}$ that fulfills $(H_{0,\parallel} + H_{0,\perp} + U_0)|\mathbf{k}ns\rangle = E_{\mathbf{k}ns}|\mathbf{k}ns\rangle$. In wave function (2), $\mathbf{p}$ and $\mathbf{k} = (k_x, k_y)$ are the in-plane coordinate and momentum, respectively, whereas $\mathcal{V}$ is the volume of the film. It is worth to point out that, due to the confinement, the density of states at Fermi energy becomes $N_F = mn_c / 2\pi\hbar^2 d$, and is therefore only weakly dependent on thickness through n_c .

At this stage, we may ask two seemingly simple questions: (i) How does the quantum size effect impact the side-jump and skew-scattering processes? (ii) Do we expect any change in the scaling relation (1)? One might try to argue that, as N_F shows, the discretization in conducting channels introduces size dependence in the density of states, which is translated into thickness dependence in the scattering rate and thus the resistivity subscribing to either side jump or skew scattering. This

appears to influence only the magnitude of ρ_{SH} and ρ , but not the formal structure of relation (1). Indeed, the transport relaxation rate due to bulk impurity alone in the presence of quantum confinement is [22]

$$\frac{1}{\tau_1} = \frac{mV_{\text{imp}}^2 n_i}{\hbar^3} \frac{(n_c + \frac{1}{2})}{d}, \quad (3)$$

where a small contribution due to spin-orbit impurities, proportional to η_{SO}^2 , has been neglected. In comparison with the rate τ_0^{-1} in the bulk, τ_1^{-1} exhibits a weak size effect through the density of states. This is not the entire story, though. As to be disclosed in the rest, a naïve picture of such, however, does not survive serious scrutiny.

First, in an ultrathin film, we must take the role of the surface roughness into account. An uneven surface along the transport direction means a continuous compression or dilation of the transverse wave function, causing exchange between the in-plane and transverse energies, which results in an additional effective scattering process. Such effect is irrelevant when we consider a bulk conductor. But in miniature structures delivered by state-of-the-art nanotechnology, this surface roughness scattering reduces the longitudinal charge conductivity and generates non-trivial thickness dependence [21, 22]. To treat a small-scale surface roughness theoretically, we apply a nonunitary dilation operator $e^{\zeta(\mathbf{p})} e^{i\zeta(\mathbf{p})(zp_z + p_z z)/(2\hbar)}$ to convert the film of a constant surface into one with a random surface [21, 22]. The surface roughness considered here has a white-noise profile with a standard deviation δ_t [27]. As a result of the dilation operation and to the leading order in thickness fluctuation ζ and η_{SO} , the total Hamiltonian for the thin film becomes

$$H_{\text{R}} = H_{0,\parallel} + H_{0,\perp}(z) + U_0(z) + V_1 + V_{\text{SO}} + V_{\text{R}}, \quad (4)$$

i.e., augmented by an additional spin-independent pseudo potential $V_{\text{R}} = 2\zeta H_{0,\perp} + [S_0, H_{0,\perp}]$, where $S_0 = i\zeta(\mathbf{p})(zp_z + p_z z)/(2\hbar)$, to be treated perturbatively. Here, we must emphasize that neither the bulk impurity potential V_1 nor the spin-orbit coupling V_{SO} is invariant under the dilation transformation, but the effects are of higher order in both ζ and η_{SO} and are thus discarded.

In order to pursue spin-Hall conductivity in the presence of both quantum confinement and surface roughness, we must establish a theoretical tool that is able to treat side jump as well as skew scattering in one setting. We introduce an operator $\hat{j}_x^z = (e/4)\{\hat{v}_x, \hat{\sigma}_z\}$ for the spin current flowing along the $\hat{x}$ direction and polarized along $\hat{z}$ [28]. The velocity operator $\hat{v}_x = p_x/m + (\eta_{\text{SO}}/\hbar)(\hat{\sigma} \times \nabla V_1)_x$, having both normal and anomalous components, is derived from Heisenberg equation. With the free electron wave function (2), we construct, using Lippmann-Schwinger equation [9], a scattered state

$$|\phi_{\mathbf{k}ns}^+\rangle = |\mathbf{k}ns\rangle + \sum_{\mathbf{k}',n'} |\mathbf{k}'n's\rangle \frac{\langle \mathbf{k}'n's | V_1 + V_{\text{R}} | \mathbf{k}ns \rangle}{E_{\mathbf{k}n} - E_{\mathbf{k}'n'} + i\epsilon}, \quad (5)$$

where symbol ϵ is a positive infinitesimal. Transition probability rate is therefore provided by Fermi's golden rule

$$P_{\mathbf{k}'n's';\mathbf{k}ns} = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar} \langle \langle |\langle \mathbf{k}'n's' | \hat{T} | \mathbf{k}ns \rangle|^2 \rangle \rangle \delta(E_{\mathbf{k}'n's'} - E_{\mathbf{k}ns}) \quad (6)$$

with the T -matrix $\hat{T} = \hat{U} + \hat{U}(E - \hat{H}_0)^{-1}\hat{T}$ that invokes the *full* scattering potential $\hat{U} = V_I + V_{SO} + V_R$. Symbol $\langle \langle \dots \rangle \rangle$ denotes the configurational average over both bulk impurity and surface roughness profile. In principle, transport and spin relaxation rates can be obtained from probability (6).

When an electric field $\mathcal{E}$ is applied along the transport direction $\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, the spin-Hall conductivity is defined as $\sigma_{\text{SH}} = -J_x^z/\mathcal{E}$ and the ensemble-averaged spin current is obtained from

$$J_x^z = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{\mathbf{k}ns} f_{\mathbf{k}ns} \langle \langle \phi_{\mathbf{k}ns}^+ | \hat{j}_x^z | \phi_{\mathbf{k}ns}^+ \rangle \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $f_{\mathbf{k}ns}$ is the distribution function. It is sufficient, in the present calculation, to partition the distribution function into $f_{\mathbf{k}ns} = f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(0)} + f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(1)} + f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(2)}$, where $f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(0)}$ is the equilibrium Fermi-Dirac distribution, $f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(1)}$ is the first-order correction due to momentum relaxation, and $f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(2)}$ is the second-order correction attributed to skew scattering. The framework outlined above is different from previous approaches using either Kubo formalism [21] or density matrix [22], and in line with the method developed by Takahashi and Maekawa [9].

The localization effect and interference between scattering events are neglected, which is justified by a low impurity concentration and weak scattering at impurities or surface roughness. Surface roughness, as an independent scattering mechanism, contributes a channel-dependent relaxation rate [21, 22]

$$\frac{1}{\tau_{R,n}} = \frac{2E_F}{\hbar} \left(\frac{\delta_t}{d} \right)^2 \frac{n^2}{n_c^4} \sum_{n'=1}^{n_c} n'^2. \quad (8)$$

We see that $\tau_{R,n}$ is proportional to d^3 , i.e., having a much more dramatic change with the thickness than τ_I . The total relaxation rate in the thin film is given by $\tau_n^{-1} = \tau_I^{-1} + \tau_{R,n}^{-1}$. The longitudinal (charge) conductivity is [22]

$$\sigma = \sigma_0 \frac{3}{2n_c} \sum_n \frac{\tau_n}{\tau_0} \left(1 - \frac{E_0}{E_F} n^2 \right), \quad (9)$$

where $E_0 = \hbar^2/2md^2$, and reduces to the Drude conductivity σ_0 when both confinement and roughness are removed [26].

We divide the spin-Hall conductivity into the one that is due to side jump and the other coming from skew scattering [9]. For the side-jump contribution, we only need

to consider the first-order correction to the distribution function $f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(1)} \approx (e\hbar/m)\tau_n \mathcal{E} \cdot \mathbf{k} \delta(E_{\mathbf{k}n} - E_F)$. This gives a spin-Hall conductivity

$$\sigma_{\text{SJ}} = \alpha_{\text{SJ}} \sigma, \quad (10)$$

where $\alpha_{\text{SJ}} = \eta_{\text{SO}} m / \hbar \tau_I$ is the dimensionless side-jump parameter [9, 29]. Equation (10) shows that the side-jump induced spin-Hall conductivity shall have the same thickness dependence as σ . This means, when the surface roughness scattering dominates the relaxation, or equivalently $\tau_{R,n}^{-1} \gg \tau_I^{-1}$, the spin-Hall conductivity $\sigma_{\text{SJ}} \sim (d/\delta_t)^2$.

The skew scattering in spin-Hall effect requires the second-order correction to the distribution function and thus the knowledge of the antisymmetric transition probability [9]. However, we find that surface roughness does not alter the antisymmetric transition probability which is merely due to the bulk impurity V_I and V_{SO}

$$P_{\mathbf{k}'n's';\mathbf{k}ns}^{(a)} = \frac{2\pi s}{\hbar} \delta_{ss'} \eta_{\text{SO}} \frac{m V_{\text{imp}}^3 n_i n_c}{2\hbar^2 V d} (\mathbf{k} \times \mathbf{k}')_z \delta(E_{\mathbf{k}n} - E_{\mathbf{k}'n'}). \quad (11)$$

Interestingly, even in the opposite scenario where the bulk spin-orbit impurities vanish yet the surface roughness provides the only spin-orbit coupling, the surface roughness still makes no contribution to the antisymmetric transition probability [25]. We further insert the transition rate (11) into the Boltzmann equation to obtain

$$f_{\mathbf{k}ns}^{(2)} = -\frac{e\hbar}{m} \tau_n \sum_{\mathbf{k}'n's'} P_{\mathbf{k}'n's';\mathbf{k}ns}^{(a)} \times \tau_{n'} \mathcal{E} \cdot \mathbf{k}' \delta(E_{\mathbf{k}'n'} - E_F). \quad (12)$$

It leads to the desired spin-Hall conductivity due to skew scattering, in the presence of confinement and surface roughness,

$$\sigma_{\text{SS}} = \frac{\beta_{\text{SS}}}{\sigma_0} \sigma^2 \quad (13)$$

where $\beta_{\text{SS}} = (\pi/2\hbar^2) m \eta_{\text{SO}} n_e V_{\text{imp}}$. If we compare the last result to conductivities (9) and (10), we see that the spin-Hall conductivity produced by skew scattering has a much more prominent thickness dependence $\sigma_{\text{SS}} \sim (d/\delta_t)^4$, so long as the roughness scattering dominates. The total spin-Hall conductivity shall combine the contributions from two mechanisms, i.e., $\sigma_{\text{SH}} = \sigma_{\text{SJ}} + \sigma_{\text{SS}}$. That side jump and skew scattering depend on thickness and surface roughness in different manners actually points to an alternative method to distinguish the underlying physical mechanisms driving the extrinsic spin-Hall effect.

On the other hand, the spin-Hall resistivity is a quantity measured frequently. In terms of longitudinal resistivity $\rho = \sigma^{-1}$, it becomes

$$\rho_{\text{SH}} \approx \frac{\sigma_{\text{SH}}}{\sigma^2} = \alpha_{\text{SJ}} \rho + \beta_{\text{SS}} \rho_0, \quad (14)$$

where $\rho_0 = \sigma_0^{-1}$ is the bulk Drude resistivity. The last expression (14), as the central result of this Letter, deserves a thorough discussion since it is highly relevant to most experiments. First, it is quintessential to realize that, in any experiment, the resistivities being actually measured are ρ_{SH} and ρ , i.e. the ones that shall subscribe to both impurity and roughness scatterings (thus the confinement effect). They shall be distinguished from the ideal bulk value ρ_0 . This fact has already been demonstrated by earlier experiments in thin films [20–22]. Furthermore, the size dependence of ρ_{SH} is governed entirely by ρ , since α_{SJ} , β_{SS} and ρ_0 are independent of thickness and surface roughness.

The above discussion leads us to consider one experimental paradigm which is rather practical in reality [19]. In order to tune the resistivity of the thin film, we *only* change its thickness or the surface roughness while keeping other parameters—such as material, doping concentration, and temperature—untouched. In this way, ρ_{SH} and ρ will change accordingly, while α_{SJ} , β_{SS} and ρ_0 shall remain constant. When plotting the curve of ρ_{SH} versus ρ , we therefore see a *linear* relation as (14) instead of $\rho_{\text{SH}} = a\rho^2 + b\rho$ which contains a *quadratic* term. In this ρ_{SH} vs ρ plot, there is a nonzero intercept (or residual resistivity) on the ρ_{SH} axis as $\rho \rightarrow 0$, which traces back to the skew scattering. Most importantly, in scaling law (14), the linear component $\alpha_{\text{SS}}\rho$ is a result of side-jump mechanism, *not* due to skew scattering, which is the contrary to what is usually interpreted using relation (1). As confinement becomes negligible in a bulk conductor, namely, the quantum size effect and role of surface roughness diminish, the value of ρ acquired in experiment may approach the ideal Drude value of ρ_0 . And it is only in this limit, we are allowed to accept the interpretation based on scaling law $\rho_{\text{SH}} = a\rho^2 + b\rho$. It is worth to note that, our analysis in this Letter is done for a system without magnetism, we nevertheless emphasize the importance to properly account for the quantum size effect and surface roughness when magnetism is present in, for example, anomalous Hall effect.

Another interesting quantity is the spin-Hall angle usually defined as $\theta_{\text{SH}} = \rho_{\text{SH}}/\rho$. As a by-product of the scaling law (14), it becomes $\theta_{\text{SH}} = \alpha_{\text{SJ}} + \beta_{\text{SS}}\rho_0\sigma$, indicating the thickness dependence of θ_{SH} follows that of σ . This relation suggests an alternative route to achieve desired θ_{SH} by altering the ratio of thickness fluctuation δ_t to thickness d , since the present experimental techniques are likely to offer better control in δ_t and d than in many other parameters such as n_i or V_{imp} .

We conclude the paper by asserting that, in spin-Hall systems constructed on ultrathin films, quantum confinement and surface roughness scattering induce thickness dependence which shall not be ignored. Such quantum size effects are embedded in the resistivities measured experimentally and the scaling law thus deviates from the one derived for a bulk conductor. Therefore, more cau-

tion shall be exercised in the interpretation of experimental data using the existing scaling relation, particularly in the case when the tuning of resistivity is accomplished by changing the film thickness. The influence of quantum confinement on the intrinsic contribution to spin-Hall effect is beyond the scope of this paper. As a final remark, we speculate that the reduction in phase space due to confinement has a rather limited impact on the Bloch states and thus the band degeneracy needed for intrinsic effect. We thus envisage the intrinsic effect to lead the contribution as ρ^2 in the scaling law. To rigorously reveal this for a real-world material, the existing numerical schemes [6, 7, 30] must be supplemented with a proper implementation of quantum confinement.

X. Wang and A. Manchon acknowledge the support from the King Abdullah University of Science and Technology (KAUST). J. Xiao acknowledges the support from the special funds for the Major State Basic Research Project of China (2014CB921600, 2011CB925601) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (91121002).

* Corresponding author: xuhui.wang@kaust.edu.sa

† Corresponding author: xiaojiang@fudan.edu.cn

- [1] M. I. D'yakonov and V. I. Perel, JETP Lett. **39**, 78 (1971).
- [2] T. Jungwirth, J. Wunderlich, and K. Olejník, Nature Mater. **11**, 382 (2012).
- [3] A. Hoffmann, IEEE Trans. Magn. **49**, 5172 (2013).
- [4] J. E. Hirsch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1834 (1999).
- [5] S. Zhang, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 393 (2001).
- [6] T. Tanaka, H. Kontani, M. Naito, T. Naito, D. S. Hirsch, K. Yamada, and J. Inoue, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 165117 (2008).
- [7] M. Morota, Y. Niimi, K. Ohnishi, D. H. Wei, T. Tanaka, H. Kontani, T. Kimura, and Y. Otani, Phys. Rev. B **83**, 174405 (2011).
- [8] A. Crépieux and P. Bruno, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 014416 (2001).
- [9] S. Takahashi and S. Maekawa, Sci. Technol. Adv. Mater. **9**, 014105 (2008).
- [10] N. Nagaosa, J. Sinova, S. Onoda, A. H. MacDonald, N. P. Ong, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 1539 (2010). And the references therein.
- [11] J. Smit, Physica (Amsterdam) **24**, 39 (1958).
- [12] L. Berger, Phys. Rev. B **2**, 4559 (1970).
- [13] T. Kimura, Y. Otani, T. Sato, S. Takahashi, and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 156601 (2007).
- [14] L. Vila, T. Kimura, and Y. Otani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 226604 (2007).
- [15] T. Seki, Y. Hasegawa, S. Mitani, S. Takahashi, H. Imaura, S. Maekawa, J. Nitta, and K. Takanashi, Nature Mater. **7**, 125 (2008).
- [16] O. Mosendz, J. E. Pearson, F. Y. Fradin, G. E. W. Bauer, S. D. Bader, and A. Hoffmann, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 046601 (2010).
- [17] Y. Niimi, M. Morota, D. H. Wei, C. Deranlot, M.

- Basletic, A. Hamzic, A. Fert, and Y. Otani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 126601 (2011).
- [18] Y. Niimi, Y. Kawanishi, D. H. Wei, C. Deranlot, H. X. Yang, M. Chshiev, T. Valet, A. Fert, and Y. Otani, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 156602 (2012).
- [19] Y. Tian, L. Ye, and X. Jin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 087206 (2009).
- [20] J. C. Hensel, R. T. Tung, J. M. Poate, and F. C. Unterwald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 1840 (1985).
- [21] Z. Tešanović, M. V. Jarić and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 2760 (1986).
- [22] N. Trivedi and N. W. Ashcroft, Phys. Rev. B. **38**, 12298 (1988).
- [23] X. Wang, J. Xiao, A. Manchon, and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. B. **97**, 081407(R) (2013).
- [24] J. Borge, C. Gorini, G. Vignale, and R. Raimondi, Phys. Rev. B **89**, 245443 (2014).
- [25] L. Zhou, V. L. Grigoryan, S. Maekawa, X. Wang, and J. Xiao, unpublished (2014).
- [26] J. M. Ziman, *Electrons and Phonons: The Theory of Transport Phenomena in Solids* (Oxford University Press, 2001).
- [27] The thickness fluctuation ζ has a vanishing mean and a finite second moment. Then the roughness profile average on the Fourier components of ζ is $\langle \zeta_q^* \zeta_q \rangle = (1/\mathcal{A}k_F^2)(\delta_t/d)^2$, where $\mathcal{A}$ is the area of the surface.
- [28] J. Sinova, D. Culcer, Q. Niu, N. A. Sinitsyn, T. Jungwirth, and A. H. MacDonald, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 126603 (2004).
- [29] S. K. Lyo and T. Holstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 423 (1972).
- [30] S. Lowitzer, M. Gradhand, D. Ködderitzsch, D. V. Fedorov, I. Mertig, and H. Ebert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 056601 (2011).